ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ED NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED001634	N.A.	000582

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Bank Street College of Education

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Progress Report: A Training Institute for Differentiation and Remediation of the Learning Problems of Culturally Impoverished Children

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Bank Street College of Education
69 Bank Street, New York, New York

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Bank Street College of Education
ST. 69 Bank Street
CITY, STATE New York, New York
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☒
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	1/65	43

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)
urban education
teaching-learning processes
psycho-educational methods
intellectual functioning
emotional responses
cognitive factors
training programs
elementary education
learning failures
pupil-teacher communication
training institutes
culturally disadvantaged

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)
Bank Street College

The current Institute program evolved from a translation of fundamental concepts of the teaching-learning process developed by Bank Street College. The psycho-educational method was based upon the premises that intellectual functioning is limited by particular patterns of emotional response and that these cognitive factors interact to support or handicap healthy growth.

A year-long training program for school personnel was initiated in disadvantaged areas of four large cities where action programs, supported by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, were located. The training program plan involved an intensive four weeks session of training-in-residence for forty elementary school teachers, guidance counselors, and supervisors from Boston, Cleveland, New York, and Washington, D. C. This intensive period was supplemented and reinforced throughout the year with planned group interaction sessions, visits, and consultations in each city by Institute staff, and with a final two-day conference at Bank Street College designed to stimulate participants to new and redirected involvement. The entire focus of the Institute was on enabling trainees to analyze better aspects of their own schools or classrooms. Reported gains were made in the greater psychological knowledge of causes of learning failure, the exactness of appropriate method, and the meaning of true communication between pupils and the teacher.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION,	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

000582

ED001634

Progress Report

January, 1965

HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CENTER FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

DIVISION OF RESEARCH
BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
216 WEST 14 STREET
NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

A TRAINING INSTITUTE

FOR DIFFERENTIATION AND REMEDIATION OF THE LEARNING PROBLEMS

OF CULTURALLY IMPOVERISHED CHILDREN

Prepared for

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
69 Bank Street, New York 14, N.Y.

BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
69 Bank Street, New York 14, N.Y.

Progress Report: January, 1965

A Training Institute for Differentiation and Remediation of the Learning Problems of Culturally Impoverished Children

This progress report covers the period from May 15, 1964 to January 1, 1965. A final report of this program will include further analysis of the processes and implications of the Institute, both as a model of training for school personnel and as an experimental laboratory for teaching educationally deprived children.

The current Institute program evolved from a translation of fundamental concepts of the teaching-learning process which Bank Street College has been developing over the years since its founding in 1916 as The Bureau of Educational Experiments. The psycho-educational method is based upon the premise that intellectual functioning is linked with emotional response, and that these cognitive factors interact so as to support or handicap healthy growth.

This concept of teaching and learning is applied in Bank Street's graduate school for teacher preparation as well as in the two laboratory schools of the College (a private nursery and elementary school, and a day care center for low-income families). Modifications of the Bank Street approach have been used in public school classrooms, in some of the most difficult New York City neighborhoods, through the direct field action program which the College has conducted for the past twenty years at the invitation of the New York City Board of Education.

During the period of June 1, 1963 - June 1, 1964, Bank Street College

extended the approach in developing a year-long training program for school personnel located in disadvantaged areas of four large cities where action programs supported by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development were in progress: An Institute for Training in Psycho-Educational Method with Focus Upon the Disadvantaged School*. The plan for the program called for an intensive four weeks of training-in-residence for forty elementary school teachers, guidance counselors, and supervisors from Boston, Cleveland, New York, and Washington, D.C. This intensive period was supplemented and reinforced throughout the year by planned group interaction in the four cities, visits and consultations in each city by Institute staff, and a final two-day conference at Bank Street College designed for evaluation and to stimulate participants to new and redirected involvement.

Experience of the Institute staff during the follow-up period in the fall of 1963 led the College to propose a second year-long institute, similar in basic format, but concentrating upon one basic theme: Differentiation and Remediation of the Learning Problems of Culturally Impoverished Children. The decision for this focus was based upon evaluations and suggestions of trainees, school officials, and project administrators in the four cities made during the follow-up period. It was reinforced by the impact upon College faculty of the proceedings and final position paper of a conference held in Dedham, Massachusetts, in September, 1963, on the Education of Deprived and Segregated Children and Youth - the "Difficult 30%." Called by Bank Street College of Education at MIT's Endicott House, the conference was initiated by the Education Panel of the Office of Science and Technology and had the support of three federal agencies, one of these the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

---

* Progress Report, January, 1964, "An Institute for Training in Psycho-Educational Method with Focus Upon the Disadvantaged School." This Institute was supported by a grant from the President's Committee on Juvenile

The position paper,* agreed to by the majority of conferees, identified school failure as a national crisis and called for aid in the strongest terms:

> "This seminar goes on record as recognizing the existence of educational disaster areas of such magnitude and intensity as to constitute one of the most grave emergencies confronting the nation. In these disaster areas, poverty, often accompanied by segregation, has produced large numbers of functional illiterates, and it continues to do so in great numbers.
>
> "We are convinced that literacy is the key to educational success. We are also convinced that failure to attain this skill predicts failure in school, unemployment, dependency, and crime."

PLAN AND MODIFICATION OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

In building upon the experience of the 1963 Institute, the faculty of the 1964 Institute reaffirmed its convictions of an effective model for a training program which has the goal of bringing about significant shifts in attitude, self-concept, and professional skills in a group of educators working in those schools where the total population is in the underachieving levels. The entire focus of the Institute was to be upon helping trainees to become more able to analyze aspects of their own schools or classrooms, in terms of greater psychological knowledge of the causes of learning failure, the exactness of appropriate method, and the meaning of true communication between pupil and teacher.

Because of the many positive responses to the 1963 Training Institute from participants, school officials, and youth project administrators in the four cities, it was decided to select trainees from the same metropolitan areas in order to continue and strengthen the interaction and communication already begun. Consequently, a planning meeting was held on June 22, 1964, which brought together representatives of President's Committee projects and school officials from Boston, Cleveland, Washington, and New York.

---

*

The meeting, held at Bank Street College, was attended by twenty-five people. (See Appendix A.) Institute faculty considered the meeting valuable in many ways. City representatives were able to indicate specific needs of their trainees and to make several helpful suggestions in regard to the summer program and future follow-up plans. Communication lines between school and project officials were reinforced, and the meeting provided useful contact between the College and those key people who could influence at local levels the ongoing effectiveness of the program.

The initial plan for the 1964-65 Training Institute for fifty trainees maintained and strengthened significant aspects of the first Institute and provided for the following features:

1. An intensive four-week training-in-residence period for teachers, guidance counselors, and school administrators.
   a) A shared living experience at International House by out-of-town trainees.
   b) Direct supervised field work experiences with individual and small groups of children in a college laboratory setting.
   c) Frequent individual guidance conferences with faculty advisors.
   d) Daily seminars focused on central content areas.
   e) Colloquia furnishing background information basic to all seminars.
   f) Field experiences.
   g) Planned social interaction.
2. Supportive follow-up visits and consultations of Institute faculty to the project cities.
3. An evaluative conference involving all Institute participants in the spring of 1965.

The plan projected the enrollment of trainees in <u>two</u> of the <u>four</u> seminars which were offered: <u>The Analysis and Remediation of Learning Problems</u>, <u>Case Studies</u>, <u>The Group Process</u>, and <u>Curriculum for the Disadvantaged Child</u>. As the schedule evolved and as the significant content to be presented in colloquia became basic study material, the decision was made to incorporate curriculum content planned for the fourth seminar as a theme in each of the

other three.

The stated plan that all trainees should have an extensive one-to-one relationship with a child was slightly modified for members of the Group Process Seminar, who, though responsible for a study of one child, worked directly with small activity groups.

The evaluation plan of the program was initiated in the orientation period when all trainees were given a series of four projective measures to assess attitude and skill:

1) A Child With Whom I Have Worked
2) Cartoon Situations Test
3) Four Dilemmas
4) Teacher Attitude Inventory

This informal battery will be repeated at the Evaluation Conference in the spring. An attempt was made to assess effectiveness of the process of the Institute through weekly reaction sheets written by all trainees.

Selection of Trainees

Two of the ideas expressed in many ways in the follow-up phase of the 1963 Institute affected selection procedures for the current Institute. One idea was that those Institute members who had worked in the same school with another member of the group found themselves more able to put into action principles or ideas developed during the intensive summer experience. The widest implementations of learnings had taken place in Cleveland in a school whose principal and two staff members had attended Bank Street together. The principal had indeed been able to convene meetings involving school personnel working in the total area of the project.

Secondly, there was general agreement that administrative backing, or lack of it, was the major determinant in influencing practice beyond a

teacher's own classroom. It was agreed that the important support of the principal could be obtained only when the general administrative policy of the system was approving of intensive and innovative programs for schools with large populations of underachieving children. It was decided to involve the Superintendent of Schools or his representative, as well as the project staff, in selection procedures.

These ideas regarding selection of trainees were reinforced by discussions of the group attending the planning meeting held in June, 1964, and described above.

Selection of trainees differed according to cities involved. In Boston, Cleveland, and Washington, school administrators and project representatives nominated several candidates, keeping in mind the suggestion of teams whenever possible. After written applications had been reviewed, Institute directors held personal interviews with candidates in the cities and, in many cases, saw applicants in their schools. Ten trainees and two alternates were selected from each city, with the exception of Boston. In that city, the directors were able to select only eight trainees. Consequently, one alternate each from Cleveland and Washington was added to the original city team.

In New York City, superintendents of school districts, in which Bank Street College has a program of field services, made recommendations of candidates. From this group, as well as from among graduate students in the College program, a group of nineteen trainees was selected. One place was held for a member of a previous institute on integration, held at Bank Street College in the summer of 1962, who has made a significant contribution to the program in her community.

This was the geographical distribution of the fifty trainees.

The group was a racially integrated one, with thirty-two Negroes and eighteen whites. There was a greater proportion of women to men than was originally hoped for, with twelve men and thirty-eight women, but there were men in each city group. Distribution of trainees at several professional levels, and in varying school responsibilities, gave the group the advantage of a variety of perspectives: Classroom teachers represented the largest group (33),but two were principals, two were assistant principals, five were in remedial or other special work, four were guidance counselors, and one was a school social worker.

All trainees went through an admissions procedure which established their elegibility for graduate credit from the College, presenting evidence of graduation from an accredited college or university. Candidates were required to fill out an application form designed to give the admissions committee as complete a picture as possible of applicants' experiences, interests, and educational background. (See attached packet.)

TRAINING INSTITUTE: JULY 1964

Orientation

Thirty trainees from Boston, Cleveland, and Washington arrived in New York on the morning of July 3rd. They registered at International House where blocks of single rooms had been reserved for them. After registration, out-of-town trainees were joined by the New York City participants for an orientation meeting planned by Institute staff. Folders containing general information about Bank Street College, the Institute, the enrollees, and specific information regarding schedules and orientation procedures were distributed to all trainees.

The meeting opened with brief introductory statements about the purpose and structure of the Institute by the Director and Co-Director, who also outlined the three-day orientation period. Each seminar leader introduced briefly the content to be developed in his seminar, relating his approach to the central problem to be studied.

Trainees introduced themselves to the group by a brief description of their roles in specific programs in their school communities. The sharing of points of view and problems that took place at this time continued throughout the Institute.

Immediately following the meeting, the first working session took place. Utilizing a prepared questionnaire, faculty advisors interviewed each trainee according to a previously arranged schedule. Advisors ascertained in these interviews educational needs and backgrounds, and seminar preferences. While interviews were in progress, trainees who were not being interviewed began work on a battery of four projective measures designed to elicit trainee responses to varied teaching situations and to determine attitudes toward children and the role of the teacher.

At a highly organized staff meeting held later in the evening, application material, information and impressions from interviews, and specific requests from trainees were pooled by seminar leaders and, after careful evaluation, determined assignment to one of three basic seminars. The same considerations determined the initial assignments of trainees to children with whom they would carry out a tutorial program.

Following an informal dinner, the entire group was addressed by Mr. John H. Niemeyer, President of Bank Street College, and Judge Mary Kohler, a trustee of the College, whose work has involved participation in research and experimental programs for disadvantaged children at the national, state, and local levels. Mr. Niemeyer gave a brief interpretation of Bank Street's theory and current role in the education of disadvantaged children in New York City schools similar to those from which trainees came. Judge Kohler challenged trainees as Institute members and educators of disadvantaged children with the severity of the educational and social problems involved and with their opportunities to assume important roles in local community action programs.

Through arrangements with the U.S. Ambassador to the New York World's Fair, Institute staff planned a field trip for trainees to the Fair on July 4. Although the visit provided an introduction to recreational opportunities of the Fair as well as further social interaction, the morning was a carefully planned educational experience. Mrs. Charlotte B. Winsor, Director of Graduate Programs, Bank Street College, addressed the group gathered in the United States Pavilion on the importance of field experiences in an educational program. Her presentation was followed by a guided tour of the Pavilion in its entirety. Because it presented characteristic ways of children's exploration of their environment, the group viewed the film, "To be Alive," presented at the Johnson's Wax Pavilion. Following luncheon,

trainees and staff were free to follow their own interests at the Fair.

The third day of orientation, July 6, brought trainees to the public school in which they were to carry out field work and related activities. Dr. Barbara Biber, Distinguished Research Scholar, Bank Street College, addressed the total Institute on "The School's Response to the Developmental Needs of the Child." She offered a universal developmental approach to children that challenged trainees to differentiate for themselves in terms of the children with whom they would work. Dr. Frank Riessman, Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, opened the colloquia sessions. Many trainees were familiar with his book, The Culturally Deprived Child, and were thus most receptive to his remarks. He reviewed his position stated in the book and reported to them his shifts and advances in differentiating the problems discussed.

Basic Program Schedule

The daily program for the four-week period to follow was conducted according to the schedule below. Within this framework there was an opportunity for a great deal of flexibility and enrichment. Individuals worked out a variety of patterns for field work and individual study. Many special activities were planned, and social evenings were held at staff members' homes as well as at International House. City groups met for planning with Institute staff, and the entire Institute met on three occasions to discuss the two Broadway plays and the foreign film that had been seen previously. One Saturday was spent on an excursion boat that sailed around Manhattan Island. (See Appendix F.)

Daily Schedule

9:00 - 1:00 P.M.	Remedial work with children in one-to-one guidance relationship for Case Studies and Remediation trainees
	Small group work with children for Group Process trainees
	Individual and group conferences with faculty advisors
	Occasional field trips
1:00 - 2:00 P.M.	Luncheon Recess
2:00 - 3:00 P.M. M W F	Remediation Seminar
	Case Studies Seminar
	Group Process Seminar
2:00 - 4:30 P.M. T Th	Remediation Seminar
	Case Studies Seminar
	Group Process Seminar
3:00 - 4:30 P.M. M W F	Colloquia: Guest speakers, films, faculty speeches, and group discussions
4:30 - 6:00 P.M.	Individual conferences, staff planning meetings, informal group discussions

The Training Laboratory: Children's Groups

During the first Institute, the nature of the remedial work effective with different children suggested further intensive study of the creative adaptations of schooling which can be planned in direct response to differentiated styles and problems of learning. It was hypothesized that the emotional and social problems of the children were determinants of the learning climates and teaching relationships that would bring about maximum learning. Based upon gross differential criteria, three children's groups were selected and organized for the 1964 Institute:

1. Culturally deprived "normal" children who did not present behavior problems in school, whose families had tried to cooperate with the school, and who were two or more years retarded in reading.

2. Children in special guidance classes in the public schools whose emotional disturbance was a major contributing factor to their learning problems.

3. "Acting out," anti-social boys with a history of school failure.

Institute staff received assistance in selecting children for all groups from New York public school personnel and the staff of Floyd Patterson House. Twenty-five children from four Manhattan public elementary schools were selected, with the help of guidance counselors, from a larger group identified by classroom teachers as extreme underachievers, even though apparently wishing to learn. These children all came from low-income families, many of whom had recently moved to New York City, and all of whom had parents with less than twelfth grade schooling. They composed Group I, the largest laboratory group.

Under the direction of the Clinical Director of the New York City Junior Guidance Program, and with the assistance of counselors in the program, ten children,whose emotional disturbance necessitated their being placed in special junior guidance classes,were selected to compose Group II.

Those children were chosen who tended to be withdrawn or to retreat, rather than to act out, and who had not yet responded to academic learning.

The third group, composed of 15 "acting out," anti-social boys, was selected from the population of a residential treatment center, Floyd Patterson House, by its staff. Floyd Patterson House is the half-way house for Wiltwyck School for Boys, located 80 miles from New York City. The latter group had recently returned to New York City after a one-to-two-year stay at the Wiltwyck School. These boys were to re-enter the New York public schools in September and would be remaining at the half-way house for the next six to twelve months. The institution felt that their attitudes toward school and their low academic skills were a major problem of rehabilitation.

Morning schedules of children and adults were arranged to suit specific needs and programs. On the basis of assumptions stated previously, individual programs for trainees and children were planned to maximize their learning. Fifteen children in Group I were involved in a one-to-one relationship with a trainee, while all children in Groups II and III were involved in such a relationship. Tutoring and group work took up only part of the morning, and trainees had the opportunity to observe children in three on-going classroom programs when they were not involved in tutorial procedures. Each group of children had a very differently designed program which exploited their natural interests and curiosities, their need for group expression, and their need for work and active play. The designs were based upon the hypotheses relating to their attitudes toward authority, to group life, and to their images of themselves as competent or inadequate in a given situation. The various classroom programs offered trainees the opportunity to study and plan curricula adapted for the particular children involved. Often trainees

accompanied classroom groups on trips designed to reinforce areas of the curriculum and broaden experiences of the children.

An extention of the training laboratory was made possible by Patterson House where appropriate clinical services were demonstrated to trainees. Group therapy, family therapy, and intake conferences were demonstrated to deepen trainees' knowledge concerning such techniques and processes. Moreover, those trainees who worked with a child from Patterson House could observe him in such sessions, have conferences with counselors and clinicians, and so acquire a more complete picture of the child.

The Seminar Groups

Although the Training Institute had a single central focus - the differentiation and remediation of learning problems in culturally impoverished children - this content was developed through three different seminar approaches. The Remediation Seminar focused upon enabling the trainees to build a psychological therapeutic relationship and to select specific techniques for remedial teaching, based upon a full analysis of the learning problems of the child. The Case Studies Seminar approached the analysis and remediation of reading problems through developing techniques for the study of a child's communication problems in the light of his total personality development. Viewing the child as a group member, the Group Process Seminar ascertained and demonstrated ways in which competency within the group and group support can aid the underachieving child.

Theoretical preparation of trainees varied widely, but all candidates had been asked to read in advance of the Institute the following books:

Heal the Hurt Child, by Hertha Riese

Intelligence and Experience, by J. McV. Hunt

How to Increase Reading Ability, by A. J. Harris

It was hoped that knowledge of these books would provide common reference points for each seminar group.

Although original planning called for each trainee to be enrolled in two seminars, the staff later decided, in view of the importance for all trainees of content presented in colloquia and the need to provide time for the discussion of this material, that intense involvement of trainees in more than one seminar was not feasible. Therefore, the plan was modified to include curriculum planning as a theme in each of the other three seminars.

Placement of trainees in the different seminar groups was made on the basis of the individual's special interests, his particular school role, and his skills or lack of skills in relation to that role. (See Appendix C.) While some guidance counselors felt comfortable in the areas of counseling techniques and the group process, they expressed need for background information and skills in remediation. Conversely, classroom teachers, who had been competently using remediation techniques, indicated interest in learning more about the group process or how to utilize a case-study approach with children who present learning problems.

With 20 trainees enrolled in the Remediation Seminar, two instructors shared the daily supervision of field work and teaching. One presented specific testing and remediation techniques,and the other developed basic principles of guidance and child development involved in remedial teaching. Each of the other two seminars was taught by one instructor, with the assistance of an experienced guidance counselor.

Goals of the Faculty for Institute Trainees

In the main, objectives for the program corresponded to those of the Remedial Teaching Seminar in the 1963 Institute. Additions reflect

the broadening and refinement of the program to include training in group work with children and an emphasis upon differentiation in diagnosing learning problems and selecting appropriate methods of remediation. Faculty objectives were to enable each trainee:

1. To involve himself affectively as well as cognitively in the learning and school problems of disadvantaged children as a prerequisite for stimulating action on their part.

2. To develop within himself an empathy with the course of learning of an individual child - with its progress, fluctuations of progress, and regression, as related to its significance in the child's life.

3. To understand the role of the teacher as a supportive resource for the child discovering his own lines of growth.

4. To distinguish between material presented by the teacher and that actually mastered by the child; to use this awareness in curriculum adjustment.

5. To develop basic skills in differentiating learning problems and learning modalities through diagnostic testing and through recognition of significant patterns of behavior.

6. To select content and method of instruction to correspond with this analysis, in both individual and group teaching.

7. To understand the life of these children in their subcultures and to recognize the implications for curriculum.

8. To study the enactment of a group program that offers individual challenge and stimulation within a supportive classroom climate.

9. To plan and carry through parent conferences where indicated, in order to establish positive communication, and gain clues to home influences on the child's learning.

10. To acquire a knowledge of and critical approach to the most significant new curriculum materials for the elementary schools, with special reference to the teaching of reading.

11. To begin to understand supervision as a positive personal experience.

Trainees were helped to concretize theory in determining ways of achieving a tutorial relationship which would enable him:

a) To bring about some degree of improvement in reading, in the intensive four-week period, through study of the child's learning pattern and remediation of his individual problems.

b) To give the child a gratifying and pleasurable experience in school learning, and in relationship to an adult as an authority figure.

c) To alter, however slightly, the child's image of himself as "dumb" or "bad" as a school child.

The goals listed above were formulated by the faculty for all trainees. Each seminar instructor set goals of a more specific nature for his particular seminar.

Remediation Seminar

While the Institute as a whole was focused on the correction of learning disability and retardation in the elementary years, the Remediation Seminar was planned for those particularly interested in developing skill in the analysis of basic causes of learning failure and in building a thorough background of remedial tools to be used with specificity, in terms of diagnosis.

Training Methods

Traditional teaching practices were used. Films, group discussion, lectures, and demonstrations of testing and working with children were all a part of the seminar hours. Children's concepts and modes of learning were discussed in relation to environmental and developmental factors.

Techniques of teaching reading were presented, with emphasis upon developing an eclectic method in which the teacher would be able to choose those techniques best suited to the individual child in various stages of reading development. Due importance was given to the systematic approach to phonetics, the use of the sight-say method, and the necessity of understanding the kinesthetic means of reinforcement of learning. Considered essential was the knowledge of these tools as well as familiarity with a variety of new books and materials. Trainees were given extensive bibliographies

and suggestions were given concerning relevant books useful for further theoretical study. (See Appendix E.)

A curriculum center was set up in the College that contained new, and proven effective, books, games, and other materials useful to the remedial teacher. Trainees utilized the center frequently, adapting materials whenever possible to the interests and educational needs of their children. The material thus presented became truly significant because of the method innovated in the 1963 Institute and reinforced through more supervision in 1964. Each trainee spent an hour and a half a day with one child throughout the four weeks. He was free to improvise and develop his own style of teaching. The trainee was introduced to the child with whom he would work without any previous information regarding his background. Members of this seminar worked with children from Groups I and III - the "normal" and"acting out" groups. The ongoing assignment was to learn as much as possible about the child through testing, interviewing, and analysis of the development of the tutoring process. Trainees were instructed in administration and interpretation of various reading and auditory discrimination tests. Test results, problems encountered in tutoring sessions, and children's progress were discussed in daily seminars.

Because urban culturally disadvantaged children are often unable to relate to many standard reading materials, trainees were encouraged to develop their own materials to use with these children. Trainees were taught to pick up clues from their children concerning their interests and to develop materials and activities through which children could experience genuine motivation.

Instructors worked closely with each student, helping trainees to analyze learning problems in their children, to determine the course of

remedial sessions, and to interpret various kinds of behavior as indications of learning blocks. Much assistance was given during seminar sessions, while more personal guidance and direction were given in private conferences. Trainees were aided in seeing how their own reactions to the children they were working with might aid or impede the learning process. An important aim of the close instructor-student relationship was to develop in each trainee an understanding of the authority figure (supervisor) as a supportive resource, rather than as a threatening figure. Instructors hoped that trainees could then view themselves as similar figures in relation to children.

Every trainee kept extensive daily logs detailing progress and setbacks of each tutoring session. These logs were read each evening by the instructors, comments were written on them, and they provided a valuable record of growth, on the parts of both trainees and children. Particular problems evident to the instructors in reading the logs, but perhaps not evident to trainees, could be picked up and discussed before they became too difficult to solve.

Opportunities for observation of their children within the classroom group setting were available. The tutor was able to see his child react to various activities (music, art, social studies, etc.) and to use observed interests, reactions, and dislikes in subsequent tutoring sessions. An important result of these observations of children within a group was the reaction on the part of many trainees to differences in children's behavior in the classroom and in tutoring sessions. Many had demonstrated to them clearly how a child thought to be "impossible" in the classroom, becomes a willing, cooperative learner in the individual setting.

Goals of the Instructors for Remediation Trainees

Goals of the faculty for all trainees have been stated earlier.

In addition to these, instructors of the Remediation Seminar set the following goals for their students:

1. To learn to interpret and administer simple reading tests, formal and informal, for use in analyzing learning problems.

2. To become familiar with new books and materials available to children.

3. To learn to take clues from children in regard to appropriate materials that would facilitate instruction.

4. To gain skill in individual remedial teaching techniques.

5. To see his child achieve some degree of improvement in reading, in the four-week period, through study of the child's learning pattern and remediation of his individual problems.

6. To understand and be able to evolve a therapeutic relationship which would support a child's positive drives.

Case Studies Seminar

This seminar was concerned with enabling workers with children to make full use of school behavior as basic material for understanding personality in order to make a creative adaptation of school life to individual needs of children. Trainees were taught to integrate school achievement with patterns of personality, taking into account the qualities of self-feeling and identity as projected on a social-behavioral level. The importance of understanding the child developmentally in relation to his learning patterns was stressed.

All trainees in the Case Studies Seminar were assigned individual children from Groups II and III - emotionally disturbed children whose disturbance was a primary factor in their learning failure. Because each trainee did remedial teaching in tutoring sessions with these children, the content of the seminar was divided in two areas: The theoretical study of child personality and case study techniques, and specific remedial teaching methods.

The seminar met each afternoon for discussion of theory and three morning conferences were held during the week for the purpose of discussing communication and remedial techniques.

Content of the seminar consisted, basically, of material presented in lectures and books that would enable trainees to begin to understand their children in terms of their modes of learning, defenses against learning, and fears and anxieties about failure. Ways to refine techniques and approaches for dealing with emotionally disturbed, culturally disadvantaged children were explored. Many trainees expressed frankly the feelings of frustration and inadequacy in dealing with such children in their own classrooms.

The instructor's approach was to allow each trainee sufficient time to relate to the child in order to begin to see for himself where a child felt inadequate, how he felt inadequate, and how he communicated. Although many trainees initially expressed a need for extensive records on the children, these were withheld in order for the instructor to demonstrate how information may be obtained through observation and interview.

Interviewing techniques with parents and children were discussed. It was pointed out how a teacher can become a direct threat to a child through the manner in which he directs questions. The non-directive approach to interviewing was demonstrated by the instructor, and trainees were encouraged to try this approach with their children and with parents. Emphasis was placed on taking clues from children and drawing conclusions about their attitudes and environments, rather than questioning directly.

The difference between specific learning disabilities, such as dyslexia, and general disabilities and emotional disfunctioning in learning areas was discussed in the seminar. The importance of the child's emotional

life in learning was also stressed. Trainees were encouraged to search for their own inadequacies, to be aware of them and how their attitudes might affect a child. Many trainees made identification with the children in this way as they also found themselves often in the position of feeling "lost," not knowing, being angry or irritated.

How children meet the learning process and what is needed in terms of curiosity and motivation before they can begin to see the symbolic level of learning was a frequent topic of discussion in individual conferences on the learning patterns of individual children with whom trainees were working.

Seminar members received instruction, through demonstration, of how to utilize a developmental history form and how to administer some diagnostic reading tests. Various materials that aid in the teaching of remedial reading were demonstrated and used by trainees, although they were encouraged to develop original materials specifically related to children's interests whenever possible.

Training Methods

As in the Remediation Seminar, lectures, discussions, films, and demonstrations presented factual information, but again the significant training method used was each trainee's one-to-one relationship with a child and the individual supervision conferences related to this. The content of tutoring sessions focused on remedial work, but each trainee was assigned the task of developing a thorough study of his child through observation in interaction, interviews, and teacher-appropriate testing. Although extensive psychological material was on file about children in Groups II and III, this was not made available to the trainee until he had made an initial formulation. It was felt that advance reading of material would

both prejudice trainees' attitudes toward their children and/or short-cut the thorough investigative study in which they were to involve themselves. When the psychological material was presented to trainees in individual conferences, the instructor played a supportive and interpretive role in discussing the reports. Most gratifying to many trainees was the similarity between conclusions they themselves had previously drawn and the psychologist's findings in many areas. Records of some of the most severely disturbed children indicated to trainees who worked with them how, in several cases, a child had made rather remarkable progress in view of the psychological evaluation.

Supportive supervision and guidance was given to all trainees by the instructor and her assistant. Trainees were observed in tutoring sessions and, later, in group discussions and individual conferences. Problems observed were discussed and specific suggestions were given. Trainees kept daily logs that recounted the course of tutoring sessions. These were read daily by the instructor, commented upon by her, and offered another opportunity to trainees to be guided and instructed as their work was in progress.

The final assignment for every trainee was to write a case study of the child he had tutored. This case study was to amplify material in daily logs and give as complete a picture as possible of the child as a learner. Appropriate case-study methods were put into practice in the final report, and this material was later used to evaluate each trainee.

Another important training method was a field trip by each trainee to Patterson House for the purpose of observing staff training sessions, intake sessions, and family therapy sessions. Many things observed in the treatment center were shocking to trainees and provided material for

emotionally charged discussions in seminars.

Observation of children within their classroom groups served to give a broader picture of children's total behavior and personalities as they were seen in interaction with their peers.

Goals of the Instructor for Case Studies Trainees

In addition to the over-all Institute goals for trainees, the instructor set as specific seminar goals the following:

1. To develop insights into children's behavior in order to understand their learning process.
2. To develop techniques for observation and recording of both affective and cognitive behavior.
3. To understand the importance of the interpersonal relationship of teacher and child as a tool for effective learning.
4. To understand and become familiar with different aspects and approaches to case study.
5. To practice in daily contacts with a child responses that encourage and develop children's strengths and abilities.
6. To understand the role of the family and important adults in the child's life - its influence on a child's goals and self-image.
7. To learn non-directive techniques of interviewing parents and children for purposes of securing information.

Group Process Seminar

The scope of this seminar's content included investigation of children's behavior in groups, in the classroom, and in other scholastic situations. Emphasis was placed on the group as part of the process of ego maturation, on the dynamics of interaction in groups with an emphasis on exceptional children, on the psychological role of the teacher and the guidance counselor in groups, and on processes specific to teachers and parents in group situations. Special attention was given to group process

where the group may be composed of culturally deprived children.

How children function in a group, and methods appropriate to improving group functioning so that a good environment for cognitive and social learning exists were concerns given special emphasis in all theoretical discussions. At the end of each week, trainees wrote a description and analysis of behavior of classroom groups they had been observing. The class used a design for the analysis of the group which helped the students to become aware of the social development (movement, regression, interaction in small and large groups, etc.) of each child. Generally, a minimum of two of the children in the small groups with which the trainees were working were studied more intensively than others. Trainees' written descriptions enabled the instructor to begin early to clear up misconceptions about group behavior. The true meaning of action and interaction was defined for the students.

A Broadway play, "The Subject Was Roses," seen by trainees and staff one evening, stimulated intensive discussion of psycho-social dynamics. The group became involved in concepts of family dynamics and personal development as they were seen in the play. Questions involved with the meaning of one individual's behavior to another and self-awareness of processes of change taking place were discussed in terms of the play, the personal lives of the trainees, and the lives of children with whom trainees were working.

Close examination of group leaders' roles and children's roles within the group was made. Trainees were challenged with moving children toward social and cognitive learning goals through the use of group structure and group dynamics.

The importance of a group leader, teacher, principal, counselor, or recreation leader, in terms of learning goals, was given a great deal of emphasis. The kinds of responses children give to certain adult-leader

behavior were observed, discussed, and practiced. The non-directive approach to group development, maximizing the contributions of the peer, was also studied.

Training Methods

In addition to the traditional methods of lectures, discussions, films, observations,and demonstrations to disseminate factual material, two significant training methods were used in the Group Process Seminar - work with small groups of four to five children in various curriculum areas, and use of role-playing techniques in the instructor's interaction with the class of adults.

Children from all three groups were involved in the small group experiences. The groups, once they were formed, were not changed. Trainees were encouraged to stay with an activity, even if it did not appear to be immediately successful, and to explore various kinds of approaches and uses of the group. However, if the activity proved, after a reasonable length of time, to be inappropriate for a particular group of children, the trainee in charge was assisted in finding another activity in which to involve children. Some groups were involved with projects that resulted in products to be used for specific parts of the children's daily classroom programs, such as sewing costumes for a class play, making scenery for a play, constructing puppets for a puppet show, and producing a class magazine. Other activities with groups were in the areas of science, mathematics, woodworking, sewing, and art. One trainee worked with a group that attempted to form a club and run it along more or less formal parliamentary procedure lines, while two other adults worked throughout July with "lunch groups," which were involved primarily with discussion and, on occasion, athletic activities after lunch.

The value of the small group experience can be demonstrated in the experience of one trainee with a science group of five "acting out," anti-social boys from Group III. Initially, the trainee was unable to develop any interest in the science experiments she demonstrated before the group. There was a great deal of disruptive behavior, and the trainee was discouraged to a point that she desired to drop the entire activity. With encouragement from her instructor and assistance from the group teacher, she was prevailed upon to continue the small class. Through diligent exploration of her group's interest and continually developing perceptions about how to use the group constructively, the trainee was eventually able to conduct science lessons with the difficult group, and to see growth on the part of the children in awareness of various scientific concepts.

Trainees kept daily logs detailing content, progress, and setbacks of group meetings, and the instructor was able to utilize the logs in individual conference periods. Problems common to many trainees were discussed in the daily seminars, as were aspects of their interaction with children observed by the instructor and his assistant.

In several seminar sessions, after the instructor had explained the technique, situations were set up which required the trainees and instructor to involve themselves in various kinds of role playing. Trainees took on roles of children, sometimes using their individual children as models, other times using hypothetical children, and roles of teachers and guidance counselors. Situations were set up that might occur in the school setting, and the "drama" was acted out. Through this method, one which on some occasions proved frustrating to those concerned, trainees gained a sense of the usefulness of role playing in the group process. It was also hoped that by placing himself in the child's position, the trainee would develop a more empathetic approach to children.

Opportunities for observation of three laboratory groups of children and training, intake, and therapy sessions at Patterson House further enriched trainees' awareness of group process.

The trainees also observed themselves as members of groups - the total Institute and various small groups. Their own goals, needs, and attitudes, with resulting shifts in behavior, were explored.

Goals of the Instructor for Group Process Trainees

1. To understand themselves in relation to others.
2. To achieve some shift or movement in personal behavior with other adults.
3. To understand the importance of the group experience in the cognitive and social development of the individual child.
4. To understand the social psychology of group functioning.
5. To learn to use techniques with groups of children in learning and social situations to improve group process as a component of the effective teacher role.

Evaluation of the Seminar Enrollees

Ratings of every trainee were made by the seminar instructors at the close of the summer Training Institute, based upon the goals of the Institute and those of the specific seminars in which they were enrolled. Impressions from initial interviews with trainees and results of projective tests taken upon entrance were compared with informal assessments of trainees' skills, attitudes, and general knowledge at the end of the four-week period. Trainees' daily logs provided a running account of their growth, and final studies of children with whom they had worked indicated how much or how little individuals had moved during the month.

Opportunities to observe trainees in their own classrooms on follow-up visits during the current academic year will be available to Institute

staff. These observations will provide further information for purposes of final evaluation, as will the repetition of the informal battery of projective measures which will be administered at the Evaluation Conference scheduled for April, 1965.

Colloquia

The colloquia established a common background for members of all seminars. Dr. Riessman, Dr. Riese, Dr. Monserrat, and Mr. King discussed the effects of a subculture - within the culture of poverty - upon the coping strength of children. Each developed patterns of positive response open to professional educators and concerned laymen.

Dr. Minuchin and Dr. John stressed specific patterns of thinking, on the one hand, and of language on the other, that develop in children whose interaction with adults tends to be non-verbal, often anxiety dominated, and weakly structured.

Dr. Williams presented the New York City compensatory education program for disadvantaged children and Mr. Pavlin drew a model of communication when a staff with the highest of goals for children deals with its own feelings of status, frustration, and need.

As the Institute came to a close, the Director drew together, from these presentations, concepts in the field of education for the disadvantaged and related them to basic Bank Street theories presented in the seminars and demonstrated throughout the laboratory school.

The speeches referred to above were recorded and are being made available to participants during the current follow-up period.

IMPACT OF THE INSTITUTE: PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

Impact of the Training Process

In advance of the Institute, the staff and members of the College

Research Division met to devise a way in which the instructors could have a more intimate knowledge of interests and developing concepts of trainees as they experienced the four weeks of the Institute. After much discussion, it was planned to ask trainees, at the conclusion of each week, to respond to questions on a prepared reaction sheet. They were encouraged to use the form as a guide only, and to be free in communicating their reactions to the Institute as a whole. In general, few trainees seemed to give responsible and important comments, although there were notable exceptions. It has been difficult to decide to what degree the meagerness of response was due to fear of negative reactions on the part of staff, to lack of experience with critical analysis, lack of feelings of seriousness, shortness of time, or general inadequacy in writing skills. It was apparent, however, that no trainee was unaffected by the Institute experience. (See Appendix I.)

During the last week of the Institute, trainees were assigned to small study groups representing members of all seminars. Trainees elected their group leaders and recorders. Each group had been requested by the faculty to discuss those aspects of the Institute which seemed to them most important in terms of future action in their communities, as well as in their own personal educational development. One trainee served as editor and, under her direction, a final paper was produced which stated the major ideas that evolved from these "Think" groups. (See Appendix J.)

Some important effects of the Institute have already been seen in initial city visits, but the true impact of the Institute will be revealed in later follow-up visits and in the spring Evaluation Conference. At this time, some projective techniques will be used to gather objective data on the year-long integration of learnings. Data gathered in this manner will be discussed fully in the final progress report of the current program.

Influence Beyond Institute Participants

The Training Institute attracted interest to an unusual degree among educators and others concerned with improving education in disadvantaged schools. Prior to the July Institute, the President of the College, the Institute Directors, and the Seminar Leaders held a press conference for representatives of major New York City newspapers, radio, and television stations. The purpose of the conference was to announce the forthcoming Institute. The President of Bank Street College and Institute staff members outlined their goals and related them to the 1963 Training Institute. Questions from the press were invited and those present were extended invitations to visit the College while the Institute was in progress.

Several newspaper reporters from New York City, as well as representatives of the press in Cleveland and Washington, visited the laboratory school in July, and newspaper accounts appeared soon after their visits. As a result of newspaper coverage and Bank Street College publicity materials, many visitors came to the College to observe work in progress and discuss training methods. (See Appendix G.) A television film of ten laboratory children, accompanied by several trainees, viewing and commenting upon a current art exhibit was made and shown over the CBS television network. Some dissemination of information, then, has already occurred through the functioning of the Institute as a demonstration to the public.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED: TRAINING PROGRAM 1964-65

The complexity of design and goals for the Institute inevitably produced problems, some of which were intrinsic in the methods, offered challenge, and on the whole furthered the educational value of the program. The experience of a non-didactic educational approach, evidenced in the expectation that graduate students could plan free time constructively, use library

resources in lieu of a text, and develop non-directed plans for field work, caused many trainees initial anxiety.

However, trainees were encouraged to proceed according to their individual teaching styles, supervision was supportive, resources were available, and the initial anxiety aroused by the non-directive approach soon formed a bridge to positive action. For some individuals, too great anxiety blocked action, but for these trainees, guidance was immediately available.

A major problem faced by seminar instructors was the uneven level of academic skills and psychological background possessed by trainees. Each seminar instructor attempted to give a high level of content and, at the same time, made every effort to understand and appeal to the level which probably should be expected of teachers in service in many school situations.

In the first weeks of the Institute, there was little discussion of racial integration problems directed by the staff; however, the frightening events that took place in Harlem, precipitated by the shooting of a Negro boy, produced mixed feelings of anger, frustration, and helplessness on the part of many trainees. Instructors sensed, in several students, the feeling that remaining in classrooms, discussing what often seemed to trainees to be abstract theories, while events of such importance were taking place in the same city,was inconsistent and a denial of reality. Attempts were made by instructors to deal with such feelings, and the opportunities offered trainees to discuss within their seminars the emotionally charged topic provided needed release.

Additional problems were related to the inconvenient physical arrangements made for the Institute. Children's groups were housed in a public school located four blocks from the College. Although in theory trainees were scheduled to spend mornings involved in tutorial work and observation

at the public school, and afternoons in seminars held at the College, in reality there was traffic back and forth throughout the morning. The use of two buildings often made communication and office procedures difficult, and when the summer heat was particularly oppressive, walking from the school to the College was unpleasant.

CURRENT FOLLOW-UP AND EVALUATION PHASE

Plans for the follow-up phase of the Institute called for two visits by the directors and seminar leaders to Boston, Cleveland, and Washington during the 1964-65 academic year, and two meetings with New York trainees.

An evaluation and refresher conference with all participants of the Institute is planned for April, 1965.

The purpose of these follow-up visits is twofold. One purpose is to evaluate, when possible, shifts in behavior of trainees within their own classrooms or within their communities, including the use of new materials and methods. Bank Street faculty has developed very brief guide lines along which the information may be gathered and organized. Information is gathered through direct observation and interviews with trainees, or with their colleagues, principals, and program directors.

The second purpose is to strengthen the impact of the Institute by giving reference material, consultation, and speeches. Wherever possible, the Institute faculty members serve as liaisons between school systems and action programs in order to keep them informed of the work of trainees within their schools and, at times, to elicit support for projects trainees would like to innovate. Trainees have been invited to use the resources of the Institute faculty in their communities in a variety of patterns.

On December 4th, the director and instructor of the Remediation Seminar visited the junior high school in Boston which had a team of four

staff members at the Institute. The assistant principal of the school, a member of the 1963 Institute, greeted them and commented upon the positive effects of the Institute. The Boston group, during the summer, had reported little hope of action within this school in which children were discouraged and hostile. It was encouraging to see that two trainees had assumed positions of responsibility since the July Institute. One has organized most competently a total school remedial reading program under the auspices of A.B.C.D. Subject-matter teachers in this program are remedial reading instructors for one period a day. Bank Street staff addressed the group of reading teachers and will send back a consultant for interviews and demonstrations. Another Institute member is faculty advisor to a newly-formed student government association. The entire enterprise called for courage in this disadvantaged school. Several other Boston trainees were visited in their classrooms,and those who were not visited will be seen on the second follow-up visit.

A meeting attended by the eight 1964 trainees from Boston was held after school hours. Trainees had the opportunity to describe their current classroom programs and to relate how they had used new techniques learned in the July Institute. They also reported a positive shift in morale. The instructor of the Remediation Seminar demonstrated some pertinent new material not used during the summer.

In Washington, the directors met first with the Washington public school administrator of the Model System, and with the W.A.Y. Project official both of whom were present at the June, 1964, planning committee meeting. The latter official had prepared a brief sheet of evaluations of the summer program based on verbal statements made by all members of the Washington group. Future plans were discussed with the superintendent who

felt that,with administrative backing, much could be accomplished during the remaining period.

The directors visited one school in which the principal and a teacher, in a unique program, demonstrated some of the special work in progress. The principal pointed out ways in which he had introduced several techniques used at Bank Street College.

An opportunity to observe and discuss programs being developed in a school in which the principal, with three primary grade teachers, had attended the Institute was made available to the directors at a visit to a second Washington school. There is room here for further consultation, but it is interesting that the principal had brought back volumes of material gathered at Bank Street and displayed it for her entire staff at faculty meetings. Again, there was a feeling of accomplishment on the part of this team.

At a general meeting of all Washington trainees around an informal dinner, several individuals remarked on the impact of the Institute upon their own teaching styles and ways of thinking about children. A second trip to Washington will be made within the near future.

In December, the directors and several Institute members met with the New York group at the Educational Resources Center of Bank Street College. Reports were given to the trainees on current activities of the College in the area of education for disadvantaged children, and a full description was given of the new Educational Resources Program of the College. Those who had attended the Institute wanted to organize two meetings - one for their colleagues and one for their administrative staffs. A tentative date for one of the proposed meetings was set for mid-February. Trainees were particularly interested in having Institute staff present to these

groups important aspects and primary goals of the Institute.

In addition to meetings with trainees, follow-up plans also called for dissemination to Institute participants of materials appropriate to their educational and classroom needs. Copies of four colloquia speeches, "Effects of Deprivation on Child Development," "The Impact of Culture on Negro Youth," "The Program of Integration and Compensatory Education in the New York City School System," and "The School's Response to the Developmental Needs of the Child," have been sent out at intervals this fall, with an accompanying letter, to trainees in all cities. Response to these mailings has been most encouraging, particularly the frequent requests for more material. Additional speeches and other material produced that relates to Institute content will be sent to participants throughout the year.

A TRAINING MODEL: PRELIMINARY FORMULATIONS

The Institute staff has experimented during the last two summers with a model of training which it has attempted to refine and evaluate. The Institute design assumes that trainees are teachers, guidance workers, or administrators whose education is often several years in the past. Even when curriculum in their schools has been determined by experts using concepts of child development and the psychology of learning, the practitioners are often not aware of the relevance of theory to daily classroom tasks.

Many of the trainees have had a limited amount of student teaching experience, and some have had none. Few have had supervision while actually teaching, other than rating by administrators. They have not experienced consultation in terms of the dynamics of behavior of children or of themselves, and they are not accustomed to viewing the school experience through the eyes of children. Rather, they are accustomed to receiving instructions in terms of the <u>what</u>, not the <u>why</u>, nor the principles which can give clues toward appropriate individualized <u>hows</u>. It is not surprising, therefore, that trainees hesitate to innovate.

These trainees as a whole were kindly toward children and thought of themselves as good teachers. Some understood and wanted change; most hoped for revitalizing skills and techniques. Very few had the concept of dramatic change of school curriculum and method, or of the importance of shifting their own attitudes toward learning.

<u>Innovative Features of the Training Model</u>

On the basis of these assumptions and apparent facts, the Institute was planned to provide a dramatically different educational milieu, even though it would produce anxiety in some trainees.

A constant focus for staff discussion was the problem of how to

challenge learning, rather than paralyze action, when the trainees found themselves in a school setting so different from their own. As trainees experienced these feelings, they were helped to recognize them in children. Empathy with a child learner was established through an intensive one-to-one relationship with a child with whom the trainee had worked for approximately twenty-eight hours during the Institute. The assignment was to establish communication, to use and develop successful modes, and to use the child's interests as a springboard to further communication and learning. At this point, it was often necessary to help teachers unlearn the teaching image which they held. Teachers tend to think of themselves as presenters, rather than enablers of learning.

The introduction of psycho-educationally trained supervisors as observers of performance was central to this plan. Such supervision enabled trainees to accept constructive help and opened new avenues of interpersonal relationships which would give them a new image of the teacher as an authority figure.

The 1964 Institute gave trainees opportunities to observe actual clinical work in progress in a residential treatment center. These observations revealed aspects of child and family life, in relation to the child as seen in school. Trainees had perhaps never fully comprehended, or had even denied, the deep significance of family disturbances for the child's school performance. Observations led to discussion and increased clarity about therapeutic and educational processes, and about scientific instead of moralistic or "warm" roles of adults for children.

Consistently, the seminars emphasized the extending of theoretical knowledge and the development of concrete skills. Thus, bibliographies on a wide range of subjects were offered. Head teachers of laboratory groups

addressed seminars. Remedial techniques were demonstrated. A materials center and consultant were available. Small groups for specialized study were organized. "Think" groups, led by trainees, developed position papers. All these activities were proposed by the staff in the attempt to develop initiative, self-direction, and a sense of adequacy on the part of the individual.

In an institute for retraining, intensive reading, study, and discussion are essential features. In the year-long plan, it is expected that leadership for continued study should come from the most advanced of the group working closely in conjunction with school and community project administrators

The addition of planned cultural opportunities was a 1964 innovation. It offered certain trainees the most effective media of presentation of ideas, channeled feelings, and provided centers of depth discussion. This should be more fully utilized in the future.

The group had an opportunity to hear two all-staff panels. Each seminar had two staff leaders, a highly recommended procedure. At the beginning of the Institute, trainee anxiety was expressed about the fact that members of the staff were not all of one opinion and did not agree on some important issues. Staff dialogue, it developed, was an unexpectedly valuable teaching device, as were the open statements made by the Director that this was accepted and valued.

The discipline of education bases much of its practice upon assumptions, but there is a level of confidence about what <u>is</u> known that enables a faculty to ask significant questions for research and experimentation, and to develop a planned program of field experimentation. Adequate recording and evaluation procedures are essential in such an undertaking. The institution must be explicit about these levels of knowledge, modes of work, and goals of the experiment.

For these reasons, the College set up a laboratory group of children with highly competent teachers, who were members of the Institute faculty, as leaders in the child groups. Trainees were told that the classrooms were settings in which to try out media, subject matter, and methods of teaching, rather than model classrooms.

As an outgrowth of experience in the 1963-64 Institute, the Director felt that it would add much needed knowledge in the field of teaching disadvantaged children if their problems of learning could be differentiated, and if certain gross differentiations could predict the type of program and teacher-authority figure that would be most effective.

It was hypothesized that a group of children whose life experiences had been educationally improverishing could learn through enriched group experiences and the presentation of individual assignments within groups. This was Group I in the laboratory school.

Another group of withdrawn and emotionally distrustful children was assumed to need a very slow, sensory approach to materials from which learning could be elicited. These children, who formed Group II, needed the support of interested, but not demanding adults.

The hypothesis was formulated that the group (Group III) of "acting out," anti-social boys should not at first be expected to learn in an interacting group, although this might be a long-term goal for these children. Each child was to be given as much opportunity and help as possible to learn what he thought was important to him, to learn without failing before the group, to have enjoyable learning experiences, to begin to form groups for desired activities (sports, puppet plays, or music, when the need for a group was obvious), and not to have group demands and group rules until the reasons for a group could be understood.

It was assumed that every teacher would have children in his own classroom who would be similar to the children in each of the three groups. It was further assumed that more specific knowledge on his part about these modes of behavior would help him to make teaching adaptations in his own setting.

Empirically, the results of work along the suggested lines have proved most promising. The results with the "acting out" boys of Group II have been especially noteworthy and easiest to evaluate, as they are in a residential center. The report from the center is that the learning of the boys was qualitatively different than in any other school setting, and that they recognize certain types of assignments or positive activities as "like Bank Street." A striking fact is that these boys had not one case of truancy in the fall term, and returned to their regular schools with a decisively more positive attitude toward schooling.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Building on the experience of 1963 and 1964, the College hopes to operate a training center for the year 1965-66 for a group of twenty trainees who are teaching in, or who are responsible for, programs for anti-social youth in public school or community programs.

The development and systematic study of the total program in a Bank Street operated public school setting, and in a residential center should yield important material to be taught in the training center. The Training Institute model, extended for a six-week period, would be maintained, with appropriate shifts in seminar focus.

The content of the colloquia will be slightly modified and the specific focus of one basic seminar will change. The program for this longer period will include two seminars as well as field work and colloquia for all students.